

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 25-27 remain in this application.

#### **Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102(e)**

Claim 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Redlich et al. (U.S. Patent 7,322,047). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claim as currently amended recites techniques for selective encryption of multiple sections within a document comprising, inter alia, storing a copy of each encrypted section of the document for each key used in the encryption process and attempting to decrypt the selected encrypted copies with the selected key by determining if a defined character string is in the selected copy of the encrypted section. No such techniques are disclosed by the art of record.

Redlich teaches a method that extracts security sensitive words, data objects, characters or icons from plaintext or other source documents to obtain (a) subsets of extracted data and (b) remainder data. Even though Redlich teaches some of the techniques of the embodiments of the present invention, Redlich does not teach or suggest the storing of a copy of each encrypted section of the document for each key used in the encryption process and attempting to decrypt the selected encrypted copies with the selected key by determining if a defined character string is in the selected copy of the encrypted section. Thus, Redlich fails to anticipate or render obvious any of the claims.

In view of the above, the cited art fails to anticipate the claimed invention. Applicant, therefore, requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

#### **Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Redlich et al. (U.S. Patent 7,322,047). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness. As indicated above, Redlich, the primary reference, fails to teach or teaches away from (inter alia) the storing of a copy of each encrypted section of the document for each key used in the encryption process and attempting to decrypt the selected encrypted copies with the

selected key by determining if a defined character string is in the selected copy of the encrypted section. Thus, Redlich fails to support a finding of obviousness in claims 26 and 27.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

In view of the amendments herein, Applicant submits that this application in condition for allowance. Passage to issuance is respectfully requested. No other fees are believed to be due. If Applicant is incorrect in this belief, please apply these charges or any credits, to Deposit Account 09-4447 (Reference Number ASU920030938US1). Applicant believes If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Darcell Walker  
Reg. No. 34,945  
P. O. Box 25048  
Houston, Texas 77265  
713-772-1255  
June 10, 2008